FILED SANGER SWYSEN & DUNKLE Attorneys at Law 2014 FEB 28 AM 11: 30 Stephen K. Dunkle, SBN 227136 125 E. De La Guerra St. Suite 102 CLERK U.S. DISTRICT GOURT CENTRAL DIST. OF CALIF. Santa Barbara, California 93101 LOS ANGELES Telephone: (805) 962-4887 Facsimile: (805) 963-7311 sdunkle@sangerswysen.com Attorneys for Plaintiffs, Jane Roe and Kip Holland UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 9 10 6 Vale up. - 1520 REV-MRWx JANE ROE and KIP HOLLAND, 11 COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES FOR: Plaintiffs. 12 1. VIOLATION OF CIVIL RIGHTS [42. VS. 13 U.S.C. § 1983]; 2. VIOLATION OF CIVIL RIGHTS [42 CITY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO: COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBIŚPO; U.S.C. § 1983]; CORY PIERCE; and DOES 1 through 3. VIOĽATIÓN OF CIVIL RIGHTS-\$0 inclusive, 15 MONELL CLAIM [42 U.S.C. §§ 1983, 1988] 16 Defendants. 4. EXTORTION 5. NEGLIGENCE 17 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL** 18 19 Plaintiffs, JANE ROE and KIP HOLLAND, hereby allege as follows: 20 21 JURISDICTION AND VENUE Jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1343, (1), (2), (3) and (4). This 22 action at law for money damages arises under Title 42 U.S.C. § 1983, Title 42 U.S. C. § 23 1985 and the United States Constitution, the laws of the State of California and common 24 law principles to redress a deprivation under color of state law of rights, privileges and 25 immunities secured by Plaintiffs by said statutes, and by the First, Fourth, Thirteenth and 26 27 Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution. Venue in this district and division is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391 (b) and 29 U.S.C. § 28

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

1132 (e), because a substantial portion of the events giving rise to the claims asserted 1 herein occurred in the County of San Luis Obispo, within the Central District of 2 California. 3 ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION 4 At all times herein mentioned, Plaintiff JANE ROE ("ROE"), was a resident of the 5 6 County of San Luis Obispo, California. At all times herein mentioned, Plaintiff KIP HOLLAND ("HOLLAND"), was a 7 4. resident of the County of San Luis Obispo, California. 8 At all times herein mentioned, Defendant CORY PIERCE ("PIERCE") was employed 5. 9 as a peace officer with the City of San Luis Obispo and the San Luis Obispo Police 10 11 Department. Defendant CITY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO ("CITY") is and at all times herein 12 6. mentioned has been a public entity and an incorporated city duly authorized and 13 existing as such in and under the laws of the State of California; and at all times herein 14 mentioned, CITY has possessed the power and authority to adopt policies and 15 prescribe rules, regulations and practices affecting the operation of the San Luis 16 Obispo Police Department, and particularly said Department's Narcotics, Patrol, 17 Internal Investigations and Training and Personnel Divisions and other operations and 18 subdivisions presently unidentified to Plaintiffs, and their tactics, methods, practices, 19 20 customs and usages. At all times herein mentioned, PIERCE was assigned to the Narcotics Task Force with 21 7. the San Luis Obispo County Sheriff's Office. 22 Defendant COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO ("COUNTY") is and at all times herein 23 8. mentioned has been a public entity and a county duly authorized and existing as such 24 in and under the laws of the State of California; and at all times herein mentioned, 25 COUNTY has possessed the power and authority to adopt policies and prescribe rules, 26 regulations and practices affecting the operation of the San Luis Obispo Sheriff's 27

Office, and particularly said Offices's Narcotics Task Force, Internal Investigations

28

HOLLAND asserted his right to remain silent. HOLLAND was booked into the jail.

- 17. PIERCE called ROE and asked her to obtain prescription painkillers for him. He told ROE not to mention the request to HOLLAND. ROE told him she was not interested in obtaining drugs for him. However, PIERCE persisted. He called her repeatedly until ROE gave in. PIERCE led her to believe that if she did what he said, he would help HOLLAND with his criminal charges. PIERCE directed ROE not to tell HOLLAND what she was doing but HOLLAND eventually found out anyway. PIERCE later demanded that HOLLAND obtain drugs for him as well.
- 18. In April of 2011, HOLLAND entered a plea in his drug possession case and was placed on probation. He was sentenced to 20 days in jail as a condition of probation and ordered to report to probation upon his release. However, PIERCE came to the jail and picked him up early. PIERCE told him not to report to probation and that he would take care of it. As a result, HOLLAND had almost no contact with his assigned probation officer and did not participate in drug testing or treatment.
- 19. PIERCE's demands of ROE and HOLLAND increased as time passed. In addition to painkillers, PIERCE demanded that ROE and HOLLAND obtain money and heroin for him. PIERCE gave ROE and HOLLAND information regarding police investigations so that they would not be caught obtaining drugs for him. PIERCE told them which drug houses to stay away from and advised them to obtain drugs at other locations.
- 20. In March of 2012, PIERCE gave ROE placebo oxycodone pills and directed her to trade the pills to drug dealers for painkillers. PIERCE also provided ROE with

methamphetamine.

- 21. ROE spent approximately six weeks in a drug rehabilitation program in Santa Barbara County, beginning in April of 2012. She got rid of her phone so that PIERCE could not reach her. When she left the program and returned to San Luis Obispo County, PIERCE contacted her and again demanded that she supply him with drugs, which led to a relapse.
- 22. In June of 2012, PIERCE directed ROE and HOLLAND to set up a drug dealer to rob him. At PIERCE's direction, ROE and HOLLAND arranged a meeting with a drug dealer. PIERCE pulled over the drug dealer shortly after the meeting and robbed him at gunpoint.
- 23. On numerous occasions, PIERCE directed ROE to go to emergency rooms and falsely describe symptoms so that she could obtain prescription painkillers for him. PIERCE followed her from the emergency room to a pharmacy to ensure that she complied with giving him the drugs. The prescription drugs include painkillers and drugs that treat opiate addiction.
- 24. PIERCE threatened ROE and HOLLAND with imprisonment if they did not comply with his demands. He followed through with the threat and had HOLLAND arrested and brought before the court on an alleged probation violation. The judge ordered HOLLAND to report to probation, but PIERCE again told him that he would take care of it. PIERCE also made threats of violence, telling ROE that he could make her and HOLLAND disappear. ROE and HOLLAND lived in constant fear of PIERCE. They believed he was capable of using his position as a police detective to plant drugs on them and have them arrested or cause them physical harm.
- 25. PIERCE used his position as a police detective to force ROE into engaging in sexual acts with him. PIERCE used the threat of arresting ROE and HOLLAND to force her to submit. In particular, PIERCE forced ROE into an act of oral copulation and, on another occasion, forced sexual intercourse. There was an additional incident when he pushed and rubbed his body up against her.

- 26. In November of 2012, ROE was arrested for entering a commercial dwelling, burglary and grand theft. She was placed in custody at the San Luis Obispo County Jail.
- 27. In January of 2013, ROE and HOLLAND reported PIERCE's conduct to the FBI and began cooperating with a federal investigation. HOLLAND agreed to record his conversations with PIERCE. The recorded conversations documented PIERCE demanding that HOLLAND buy and sell drugs for him.
- 28. On February 5, 2013, PIERCE was arrested by the FBI. On March 1, 2013, he was indicted in United States District Court for the Central District of California for bribery in violation of Title 18 USC § 666(a)(1)(B) and extortion in violation of Title 18 USC § 1951. On July 8, 2013, Piece entered a plea of guilty to one count of extortion. On December 9, 2013, he was sentenced to 18-months in the Bureau of Prisons. He began serving his sentence on January 27, 2014.
- 29. As a result of her arrest in November of 2012, ROE was sentenced to serve a jail term at the San Luis Obispo County Jail. As a result of her cooperation in the investigation of PIERCE, ROE is serving her jail time in protective custody. She is confined to a 10x10 cell for 23 hours a day. Unlike inmates in the general population, she is unable to participate in self-improvement programs at the jail including a 12-step program.
- 30. Plaintiffs timely filed government tort claims with CITY.

# 20 FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION BY PLAINTIFF JANE ROE FOR VIOLATION OF

# CIVIL RIGHTS AGAINST DEFENDANT PIERCE

## (42 U.S.C.§ 1983)

- 31. Plaintiff JANE ROE incorporates by this reference, as if fully set forth herein, the allegations set forth in the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint.
- 32. Commencing at or about the aforementioned dates and places, without cause or justification, and acting under color of law, Defendant PIERCE intentionally and maliciously deprived ROE of rights secured to her by the First, Fourth, Thirteenth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution. PIERCE subjected ROE to

- extortion, indentured servitude, sexual assault and molestation and deprived her of rights secured by the United States Constitution.
- 33. As a proximate result of the aforesaid acts and omissions of PIERCE, ROE sustained great physical and mental pain and shock to her nervous system, fear, anxiety, torment, degradation and emotional distress.
- 34. By reason of the aforementioned acts and omissions of PIERCE, ROE was compelled to secure the services of an attorney at law to redress the wrongs hereinbefore mentioned and by virtue thereof, ROE is indebted and liable for attorneys fees.
- 35. The aforementioned acts and omissions of PIERCE were committed knowingly, wilfully and maliciously, with the intent to harm, injure, vex, harass and oppress ROE with a conscious disregard of ROE's constitutional rights and by reason thereof, Plaintiff seeks punitive and exemplary damages from PIERCE in an amount as proved.

# SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION BY PLAINTIFF KIP HOLLAND FOR VIOLATION OF CIVIL RIGHTS AGAINST DEFENDANT PIERCE (42 U.S.C.§ 1983)

- 36. Plaintiff KIP HOLLAND incorporates by this reference, as if fully set forth herein, the allegations set forth in the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint.
- 37. Commencing at or about the aforementioned dates and places, without cause or justification, and acting under color of law, Defendant PIERCE intentionally and maliciously deprived HOLLAND of rights secured to him by the First, Fourth, Thirteenth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution. PIERCE subjected HOLLAND to extortion and indentured servitude and deprived him of rights secured by the United States Constitution.
- 38. As a proximate result of the aforesaid acts and omissions of PIERCE, HOLLAND sustained mental pain and shock to his nervous system, fear, anxiety, torment, degradation and emotional distress.
- 39. By reason of the aforementioned acts and omissions of PIERCE, HOLLAND was

compelled to secure the services of an attorney at law to redress the wrongs hereinbefore mentioned and by virtue thereof, HOLLAND is indebted and liable for attorneys fees.

40. The aforementioned acts and omissions of PIERCE were committed knowingly, wilfully and maliciously, with the intent to harm, injure, vex, harass and oppress HOLLAND with a conscious disregard of HOLLAND's constitutional rights and by reason thereof, HOLLAND seeks punitive and exemplary damages from PIERCE in an amount as proved.

# THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION BY PLAINTIFFS JANE ROE AND KIP HOLLAND FOR VIOLATION OF CIVIL RIGHTS (42 U.S.C.§§ 1983, 1988) AGAINST DEFENDANTS CITY AND COUNTY (MONELL CLAIM)

- 41. Plaintiff ROE incorporates by this reference, as if fully set forth herein, the allegations set forth in the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint.
- 42. Defendants CITY and COUNTY are and at all times herein mentioned have been public entities and municipalities duly authorized and existing as such in and under the laws of the State of California; and at all times herein mentioned, possessed the power and authority to adopt policies and prescribe rules, regulations and practices affecting the operation of the San Luis Obispo Police Department and San Luis Obispo County Sheriff's Office, respectively, and in the tactics, methods, practices, customs and usages related to internal investigations, personnel supervision and records maintenance, and the proper uses of force by their rank and file, generally.
- 43. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants CITY and COUNTY implicitly or explicitly adopted and implemented careless and reckless policies, customs, or practices, and failed to provide sufficient training for Defendant PIERCE.
- 44. Defendants CITY and COUNTY knowingly maintain and permit official *sub-rosa* policies or customs of permitting the occurrence of the kinds of wrongs set forth herein, by deliberate indifference to police abuse, failing and refusing to fairly and impartially investigate, discipline or prosecute peace officers who commit acts of felonious

dishonesty and crimes, each ratified and approved by CITY and COUNTY.

1

3

4

5

13

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- 45. Defendants CITY and COUNTY'S customs, policies, practices and/or procedures create and allow for, *inter alia*, an ongoing pattern by all Defendants of condoning and having a deliberate indifference toward citizens' constitutional rights, specifically in connection with PIERCE'S violations of Plaintiffs' rights.
- 6 46. Defendants CITY and COUNTY's customs, policies, practices and/or procedures create and allow for, *inter alia*, a failure by CITY and COUNTY to adequately train, supervise, discipline, screen and hire police officers in connection with citizens' constitutional rights.
- 10 47. Specifically, but not limited to, the policy of failing to train and supervise narcotics officers working with informants allowed Defendant PIERCE to act with impunity in connection with violating citizens' constitutional rights.
  - 48. Defendants CITY and COUNTY'S actions constitute deliberate indifference.
- 14 | 49. Defendant PIERCE acted in conformity with this policy of deliberate indifference to constitutional rights when he violated Plaintiffs' civil rights.
- 16 50. Defendants CITY and COUNTY's policies, customs or practices, caused Plaintiffs'17 injuries.
- 18 51. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants CITY and COUNTY'S acts and omissions, Plaintiffs have suffered and continues to suffer from mental pain, fear, anxiety, torment, degradation and emotional distress.

# FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION BY PLAINTIFFS JANE ROE AND KIP HOLLAND FOR EXTORTION AGAINST DEFENDANTS CORY PIERCE AND CITY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO

- 52. Plaintiffs ROE and HOLLAND incorporates by this reference, as if fully set forth herein, the allegations set forth in the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint.
- 53. Defendant PIERCE, with the intent to extort money and property from Plaintiffs, made express and implied threats:

a. to do an unlawful injury to the person or property of Plaintiffs; 1 b. to accuse Plaintiffs of crimes; 2 c. to expose, or impute to Plaintiffs, alleged crimes; and 3 d. to expose secrets affecting Plaintiffs. 4 54. Defendant PIERCE made the threats described above to extort money and other 5 property from Plaintiffs, i.e. to obtain money and property from Plaintiffs with their 6 consent, which consent PIERCE sought to induce by a wrongful use of fear. 7 55. Defendant PIERCE made the following specific threats in order to wrongfully 8 generate fear in Plaintiffs: (1) to arrest and incarcerate Plaintiffs for crimes they did 9 not commit; and (2) to make Plaintiffs "disappear." 10 56. The extortion caused Plaintiffs great physical and mental pain and shock to their 11 nervous systems, fear, anxiety, torment, degradation and emotional distress. 12 57. Defendant PIERCE was acting in the course and scope of his employment with the 13 San Luis Obispo Police Department and Defendant CITY is vicariously liable 14 pursuant to California Government Code § 815.2. 15 16 FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION BY PLAINTIFFS JANE ROE AND KIP HOLLAND 17 FOR NEGLIGENCE AGAINST DEFENDANTS CORY PIERCE AND CITY OF 18 SAN LUIS OBISPO 19 58. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs 20 21 inclusive, as though fully set forth therein. 59. Defendant PIERCE owed a duty of care to Plaintiffs and breached that duty by 22 23 negligently and unreasonably extorting Plaintiffs without legal justification. 60. Defendant PIERCE was acting in the course and scope of his employment with the San 25 Luis Obispo Police Department and Defendant CITY is vicariously liable pursuant to California Government Code § 815.2. 26 **PRAYER** 27 28 WHEREFORE, PLAINTIFF prays for judgment against Defendants, and each of them,

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

Case 2:14-cv-01520-RGK-MRW Document 1 Filed 02/28/14 Page 11 of 18 Page ID #:14

1	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL								
2	Plaintiffs hereby demand a jury trial as provided by Rule 38(a) of the Federal Rules of								
3	Civil Procedure.								
4	Dated: February 25, 2014 SANGER SWYSEN & DUNKLE								
5	AG								
6	By:								
7	Stephén K. Dunkle Attorneys for Plaintiffs Jane Roe and Kip Holland								
8	Jane Roe and Kip Holland								
9									
10									
11									
12									
13									
14									
15									
16	· ·								
17									
18									
19									
20									
21									
22									
23									
24									
25									
26									
27									
28									
	12								

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

### NOTICE OF ASSIGNMENT TO UNITED STATES JUDGES

This case has be	en assigned to District Judge	R. Gary Klausner	and the assigned				
Magistrate Judge is	Michael R. Wilner						
The cas	se number on all documents filed v	vith the Court should read	d as follows:				
	2:14-cv-01520 F	tGK-MRWx					
•	eral Order 05-07 of the United Sta						
California, the Magistra	te Judge has been designated to he	ar discovery related motion	ons.				
All discovery rel	All discovery related motions should be noticed on the calendar of the Magistrate Judge.						
		Clerk, U. S. District	Court				
		0.01.15, 0.0, 2.101.100					
February 28, 2	2014	By SBOURGEOIS					
Date		Deputy Clerk					
	NOTICE TO (	COUNSEL					
= -	st be served with the summons and e must be served on all plaintiffs).	complaint on all defendar	nts (if a removal action is				
Subsequent document	s must be filed at the following lo	cation:					
Western Division 312 N. Spring Str Los Angeles, CA	eet, G-8 411 West Fourth S	St., Ste 1053 3470	ern Division Twelfth Street, Room 134 rside, CA 92501				
Failure to file at the proper location will result in your documents being returned to you.							

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

JANE ROE and KIP HOLLAND	
Plaintiff(s)  v.  CITY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO; COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO; CORY PIERCE; and DOES 1 through of inclusive	CVII4-10520 REX-men.
Defendant(s)	)

#### SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: (Defendant's name and address) City of San Luis Obispo, 990 Palm Street, San Luis Obispo, CA 93401

County of San Luis Obispo, 1055 Monterey Street, San Luis Obispo, CA 93408

Cory Pierce, Federal Bureau of Prisons, Metropolitan Correctional Center, 808 Union Street San Diego, CA 92101

A lawsuit has been filed against you.

Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are: Stephen K. Dunkle

SANGER SWYSEN & DUNKLE 125 E. De La Guerra Street, Suite 102 Santa Barbara, CA 93101

If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.

Date:

Signature of Clerkor Delivery

1184

AO 440 (F	Rev. 06/12)	Summons in a	Civil Action	(Page 2)

Civil Action No.

#### PROOF OF SERVICE

(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (1))

	This summons for (name	of individual and title, if any)							
was re	ceived by me on (date)	• .	_ •						
•	☐ I personally served th	e summons on the indiv	idual at (place)						
		<del></del>	or	(date)	; ог				
	☐ I left the summons at	the individual's residence	ce or usual plac	ee of abode with (name)					
	, a person of suitable age and discretion who resides there,								
	on (date) , and mailed a copy to the individual's last known address; or								
	☐ I served the summons	S 011 (name of individual)			,	who is			
	designated by law to accept service of process on behalf of (name of organization)								
			OI OI	l (date)	; or				
	☐ I returned the summo	ns unexecuted because				; or			
	☐ Other (specify):								
	My fees are \$	for travel and \$		for services, for a total of \$	0.00				
	I declare under penalty of	of perjury that this inform	nation is true.						
Date:				Server's signature					
	·			Printed name and title	<u>,</u>				
		_		Server's address					
				Del Vel S UMM ESS					

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc:

## Case 2:14-cv-01520-RGK-MRW Document 1 Filed 02/28/14 Page 16 of 18 Page ID #:19

# UNITED S. ATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

I (a) DI AINTIEEC ( Cha	olch ov if very ear very			EN SHEET	<del></del>			
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS ( Che	eck box if you are repre	<b>DEFENDANTS</b> (Check box if you are representing yourself)						
JANE ROE and KIP HOLLAND				CITY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO; COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO; CORY PIERCE; and DOES 1 through 50 inclusive				
(b) County of Residence	of First Listed Plain	tiff San Luis Obisp	0 (	County of Reside	ence of Firs	t Listed Defer	ndant	
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CAS	ES)			IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CA.				
(c) Attorneys (Firm Name representing yourself, pro	vide the same informa	ation.	ľ	Attorneys (Firm Neepresenting your	lame, Addres self, provide	ss and Telephon the same infor	e Number) If you mation.	are
Barbara, CA 93101, (805) 962								
II. BASIS OF JURISDIC	TION (Place an X in o	ne box only,)	III. CITI	ZENSHIP OF PE	RINCIPAL F	PARTIES-For D	Diversity Cases Or	
1. U.S. Government Plaintiff	3. Federal Q	uestion (U,S. 1 Not a Party)	(Pia Citizen o	ace an X in one bo	ox for plainting TF DEF 1 1 1 1 2 2 2	If and one for d Incorporated or of Business in th Incorporated ar	lefendant) r Principal Place his State nd Principal Place	PTF DEF
2. U.S. Government Defendant	4. Diversity (i of Parties in I		Citizen o Foreign (	r Subject of a Country	] 3 🗍 3	of Business in A Foreign Nation		☐ 6 ☐ 6
IV. ORIGIN (Place an X	in one box only.)	<u></u>	L.,					<del></del> -
1. Original 2.1		3. Remanded from Appellate Court		stated or 5. Tra	ansferred from Istrict (Specify)	Another	. Multi- District itigation	
V. REQUESTED IN COM	MPLAINT: JURY DE	MAND: X Yes	No	(Check "Yes" o	nly if dema	nded in com	 plaint.)	<del></del>
<b>CLASS ACTION under</b>	F.R.Cv.P. 23:	Yes ⊠No	-  X	MONEY DEMA				o proof
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION 42 U.S.C. section 1983, 1988 and negligence	(Cite the U.S. Civil Statut for violation of Plaintiffs'	e under which you are fili civil rights; additional sta	ing and w	vrite a brief statemer	nt of cause . F	lo not site insigni		
VII. NATURE OF SUIT (	Place an X in one bo	ox only).				<del></del>	·	
OTHER STATUTES	CONTRACT	REAL PROPERTY CONT	r. Carl	MMIGRATION	PRISONE	R PETITIONS	PROPERTY	/ RIGHTS
375 False Claims Act	110 Insurance	240 Torts to Land		62 Naturalization	Habe	as Corpus:	820 Copyrigh	2.15 1.16 2. 2. 2. 2. 2.
☐ 400 State Reapportionment	120 Marine	245 Tort Product Liability		pplication 55 Other		n Detainee	830 Patent	
410 Antitrust	130 Miller Act	290 All Other Real		nmigration Actions	└─ Sentend		840 Trademar	·k
430 Banks and Banking	140 Negotiable	Property TORTS	PFR	TORTS ONAL PROPERTY	530 Ger	neral ith Penalty	SOCIAL SI	
☐ 450 Commerce/ICC Rates/Etc.	150 Recovery of	PERSONAL INJURY	3.4 <u>- 3.5 3.5 3.5</u>	70 Other Fraud		Other:	861 HIA (1395	
460 Deportation	Overpayment & Enforcement of	310 Airplane 315 Airplane	I	71 Truth in Lending		ndamus/Other	862 Black Lun	
470 Racketeer Influ-	Judgment	Product Liability	31	80 Other Personal	550 Civi		☐ 864 SSID Title	
enced & Corrupt Org.	151 Medicare Act	320 Assault, Libel & Slander	' I ''	roperty Damage	555 Pris	on Condition	865 RSI (405 (	
480 Consumer Credit 490 Cable/Sat TV	152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loan (Excl. Vet.)	330 Fed. Employers' Liability	Pr	35 Property Damage oduct Liability	560 Civi Condition		FEDERALT	
850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange	153 Recovery of	340 Marine 345 Marine Product	4.	22 Appeal 28		JRE/PENALTY	☐ 870 Taxes (U.: Defendant)	5. Plaintiff or
890 Other Statutory	Overpayment of Vet. Benefits	□ Liability	- 42	SC 158 23 Withdrawal 28	☐ 625 Dru Seizure	g Related of Property 21	871 IRS-Third	Party 26 USC
☐ Actions ☐ 891 Agricultural Acts	160 Stockholders' Suits	350 Motor Vehicle 355 Motor Vehicle	UU	SC 157 CIVIL RIGHTS	USC 881	1 ,		
893 Environmental	190 Other	Product Liability  360 Other Personal	- I	40 Other Civil Rights	<u> </u>	ABOR		
☐ Watters ☐ 895 Freedom of Info.	Contract	∟ <sub>Injury</sub>	-   □ 4	41 Voting		Labor Standards	1	
⊔ <sub>Act</sub>	195 Contract Product Liability	362 Personal Injury Med Malpratice	<sup>-</sup>	12 Employment		or/Mgmt.		
896 Arbitration	196 Franchise	365 Personal Injury- Product Liability		13 Housing/ ccommodations	Relation	ıs		
899 Admin. Procedures Act/Review of Appeal of Agency Decision	REAL PROPERTY  210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure	367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability	Di Er	45 American with isabilities- nployment 46 American with				
950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability	ᄓ	isabilities-Other	Litigatio	n ployee Ret. Inc.		
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:	Case Numbe	r:		U	V14	-152	20	
CV-71 (11/13)		<del></del>	VIL COVE	R SHEET	7	<u> </u>	<del>-</del> U	7 co 1 of 2

Page 1 of 3

# UNITED LEATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

**VIII. VENUE**: Your answers to the questions below will determine the division of the Court to which this case will most likely be initially assigned. This initial assignment is subject to change, in accordance with the Court's General Orders, upon review by the Court of your Complaint or Notice of Removal.

Question A: Was this case removed from state court?	STATE CASE WAS PE	NDING IN THE COL	JNTY OF:	INITIAL DIVISION IN CACD IS:	
Yes 🗷 No	Los Angeles	Western			
If "no, " go to Question B. If "yes," check the	Ventura, Santa Barbara, or San	Western			
box to the right that applies, enter the corresponding division in response to	☐ Orange			Southern	
Question D, below, and skip to Section IX.	Riverside or San Bernardino			Eastern	
Question B: Is the United States, or one of its agencies or employees, a party to this action?  Yes No  If "no, " go to Question C. If "yes," check the box to the right that applies, enter the corresponding division in response to Question D, below, and skip to Section IX.	Then check the box below for the county in which the majority of DEFENDANTS reside.  Los Angeles  Ventura, Santa Barbara, or San Luis Obispo Orange Riverside or San Bernardino Riverside or San Bernardino		A DEFENDANT?  I check the box below for the counied the majority of PLAINTIFFS resonances  Angeles  Intura, Santa Barbara, or San Li	western	
Question C: Location of plaintiffs, defendants, and claims? (Make only one selection per row)  Indicate the location in which a majority of plaintiffs reside: Indicate the location in which a majority of defendants reside:		C Orange County	D. Riverside or San Bernardino Counties	E. F. Outside the Central Other District of California	
Indicate the location in which a majority of claims arose:					
C.1. Is either of the following true? If so, ch  2 or more answers in Column C  only 1 answer in Column C and no a	C.2. Is either of the following true? If so, check the one that applies:  2 or more answers in Column D only 1 answer in Column D and no answers in Column C  Your case will initially be assigned to the EASTERN DIVISION. Enter "Eastern" in response to Question D, below.  If none applies, go to the box below.				
Your case will initially be a SOUTHERN DIVI Enter "Southern" in response to If none applies, answer quest					
		nitially be assigned FERN DIVISION. esponse to Questio			
Question D: Initial Division?			INITIAL DIVISIO	IN IN CACD	
Enter the initial division determined by Quest	tion A, B, or C above:		WESTERN D	The state of the second	

CV-71 (11/13)

# UNITED S... (ES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF LALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

IX(a). IDENTICAL CAS	<b>ES</b> : Has this act	ion been previously filed in this court and dismissed, remanded or closed?	⊠ NO	☐ YES		
If yes, list case numb	per(s):					
IX(b). RELATED CASES	<b>S</b> : Have any case	es been previously filed in this court that are related to the present case?	⊠ NO	YES		
If yes, list case numb	per(s):					
Civil cases are deemed r	elated if a previou	usly filed case and the present case:				
(Check all boxes that app!	ly) A. Arise fi	rom the same or closely related transactions, happenings, or events; or	•			
	B. Call for	r determination of the same or substantially related or similar questions of law and fact	; or			
	C. For oth	ner reasons would entail substantial duplication of labor if heard by different judges; or				
		e the same patent, trademark or copyright <u>, and</u> one of the factors identified above in a		sent.		
X. SIGNATURE OF AT (OR SELF-REPRESENT		: DATE:	February 25	5, 2014		
other papers as required by	law. This form, and	Civil Cover Sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement proved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required propose of statistics, venue and initiating the civil docket sheet. (For more detailed instruc	surrupet to Local	Dula 2 diament Clad		
Key to Statistical codes relati	ing to Social Secur	ity Cases:	· · ·			
Nature of Suit Code	Abbreviation	Substantive Statement of Cause of Action				
861	HIA	All claims for health insurance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social include claims by hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers (42 U.S.C. 1935FF(b))	l Security Act, as s of services unde	amended. Also, er the program.		
862	BL	All claims for "Black Lung" benefits under Title 4, Part B, of the Federal Coal Mine Hea 923)	Ith and Safety Ac	ct of 1969. (30 U.S.C.		
863	DIWC	All claims filed by insured workers for disability insurance benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended; plus all claims filed for child's insurance benefits based on disability. (42 U.S.C. 405 (g))				
863	D <b>iww</b>	All claims filed for widows or widowers insurance benefits based on disability under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. 405 (g))				
864	SSID	All claims for supplemental security income payments based upon disability filed unamended.	der Title 16 of th	e Social Security Act, as		
865	RSI	All claims for retirement (old age) and survivors benefits under Title 2 of the Social So (42 U.S.C. 405 (g))	ecurity Act, as an	nended.		